

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 30, 1952

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, D. C.

The committee met at 10 a. m., Hon. Carl Vinson (chairman of the committee) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the committee come to order.

This is a continuation of the hearing on the universal military training bill.

The first witness this morning is Brig. Gen. Herbert C. Holdridge, United States Army, retired, of Detroit, Mich.

Now, I see several Members of the House here who have been accorded the privilege to testify. It will be probably after lunch that we will call the Members to testify. I announce that so if any of the Members want to go to their offices they can do so.

All right, now, General Holdridge.

STATEMENT OF BRIG. GEN. HERBERT C. HOLDRIDGE, UNITED STATES ARMY (RETIRED), DETROIT, MICH.

General HOLDRIDGE. Mr. Chairman and members of the Armed Services Committee, I am Brig. Gen. Herbert C. Holdridge, United States Army, retired.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt a moment.

Couldn't we set a definite time for the Members of Congress to come back? There are about four Members back there.

The CHAIRMAN. I would suggest 2 o'clock.

Mr. BROOKS. Two o'clock.

Mr. CLEMENTE. I don't know whether they heard this or not.

The CHAIRMAN. Go right ahead, now, sir.

General HOLDRIDGE. I am Brig. Gen. Herbert C. Holdridge, United States Army, retired.

I am being sponsored as a candidate for the office of President of the United States by the American Rally, which is an organization recently formed to rally the American people for peace, abundance, and the Constitution, and which has approved the statement I am about to make.

My associate is Mr. Burr McCloskey, a former infantryman machine gunner in General Patton's army, and, at present, campaign manager of the American Rally.

I was informed by your chairman that I would be granted only 20 minutes to present a summary of my views. That time is totally inadequate for logical presentation of the report I want to give to you.

Your chairman is quoted in the Detroit News of Sunday as having explained rather bitterly that there is nothing new being presented before this committee by the opponents of UMT. I have something completely new to present to this committee and I can't see how what I have to present can be presented in this very short time of 20 minutes. My analysis is an entirely new approach to the subject which will not be covered by other witnesses before this committee.

On the one hand, it constitutes a military estimate of the situation, such as must be applied under Army doctrine to any military problem and has not been applied to UMT.

This analysis must proceed step by step in accordance with established techniques. No brief summary can adequately replace such a careful analysis.

On the other hand, it goes into the fundamental causes of war and UMT, without which this problem can't be considered intelligently.

These causes have not been touched upon by leaders of peace groups who have generally been content to deal with symptoms rather than with disease itself.

I have also been limited to discussing only the proposed plan of the implementation of the National Security Training Commission and I have not been permitted to deal with the principle itself.

I protest this decision because we deny that that principle has in fact been settled as maintained by your chairman and because the opposition has been permitted to testify in favor of the principle.

These limitations constitute a violation of my right to petition Congress. I now request permission of this committee for a full presentation of the entire issue. I present to you here, in this basket, letters and petitions and telegrams from all over the United States, east and west and middle of the United States, which were sent here because we merely sent a short message to certain peace groups and civic groups, organized labor and what not, that we needed some support here. And this is the result. Those letters and telegrams and petitions in this basket represent probably 100,000 people in the United States. And if we had had time we could mobilize just as many millions as we have hundreds of thousands. Because these people want this presented, I ask now for this committee to give me opportunity to present the entire program.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed in your own way and the committee will judge as you go along as to the length of time that you will be given to present your views.

A VOICE. And God be with you, General Holdridge.

The CHAIRMAN. Let there be order in the committee room, now.

General HOLDRIDGE. I should like, Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Go right ahead, now.

General HOLDRIDGE. This study is rather long, but it is important. We are dealing now with something vital to the life of the American people. We are dealing with two opposing philosophies that have come into the life of the American people.

One is a philosophy of democracy and the right of the individual and the other is the philosophy of fascism and regulation and regimentation.

So I hope you will bear with me as I present this study to you.

I am going to skip the summary of my military training, except to point out I am a graduate of West Point, a classmate of Ridgway and

Collins and Mark Clark. I was at West Point with Eisenhower and Bradley. I served in the Army 30 years honorably, was retired honorably, and I served mostly in administrative and in instructional capacities. Much of my experience in the Army as a teacher dealt with training young men, with developing training program for the Army and for civilians.

I feel I am fully qualified to present this situation from the military point of view. Since my retirement in 1944, I have been in close touch with American people at the grass roots. I have appeared before committees of Congress in opposition to UMT. And I was credited by the Pentagon, according to personal information, with having blocked its passage in 1946. I accept that as a great honor. I believe it is true to a degree, and I accept it.

I have debated the issue against the best talents the Pentagon had to offer, including Senator Wadsworth and Dr. Compton. I feel, therefore, that I can speak with a degree of authority on training programs in general and on this particular issue of UMT in particular.

Our organization requested permission—I will skip that, also.

I graduated from West Point in 1917, and am a classmate of Generals Ridgway, Mark Clark, and J. Lawton Collins. Whereas their experience has been largely with troops and in combat, my military experience has been primarily in instructional and administrative fields. I was an instructor in social sciences, and assistant professor of history at West Point, and briefly an instructor in history at Columbia University.

As an administrator I served at major headquarters in the United States, as well as in Europe and the Philippines. During World War II, I established, and was commandant of, the Adjutant General's School, Fort Washington, Md., which, with its many branches at colleges and universities, graduated some 35,000 trained administrators under my administration. I served on the academic staff of the Cavalry School at Fort Riley, Kans., where my duties concerned the preparation of extension courses in basic training for CMT camps, ROTC, ORC, and the National Guard.

I am a graduate of the Command and General Staff School, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., and my name is carried on the General Staff eligible list.

My duties in the Army kept me constantly in touch with the preparation and execution of training programs. I hold a B. S. degree from West Point, an M. A. degree from Columbia University in social sciences, and two doctor of laws degrees from civilian universities for my administrative attainments, one of these being the annual award to the individual who had contributed most, during the preceding year, to the advancement of sound public administration.

Since my retirement in 1944 I have been in close touch with the American people at the grass roots, have appeared before committees of Congress in opposition to UMT, was credited by the Pentagon—according to personal information—with having blocked its passage in 1946—which I accept as a great compliment—and have debated the issue against the best talent the Pentagon had to offer, including Senator Wadsworth and Dr. Compton. I feel, therefore, that I can speak with a degree of authority on training programs in general, and on this particular issue of UMT in particular.

Our organization requested permission to challenge the issue of UMT in principle, but were denied by your chairman, who insisted that it was the vote of this body that UMT, in principle, had been passed by Congress, and that discussion before this committee must be limited solely to the issue of implementation of UMT—the pros and cons of the National Security Training Commission's plan. We rejected any such conclusion in a letter to your chairman, and copies of that letter have been furnished you.

Although appearing before this committee at the moment on this issue of implementation of the plan, we wish to record a vehement exception to the conclusion that the issue of UMT has been settled in principle. We reject the conclusion because we know that the American people have already rejected UMT and because your chairman has promised Congress "another look at UMT," which carries the clear conclusion that Congress has not yet made up its mind.

Therefore, while appearing in opposition to the plan of implementation, we deny the conclusion that the principle is settled, and reserve full freedom of action to fight it out by every legitimate means within our power, including taking this issue to the people in the next election, in which I am a candidate for the President of the United States.

If I can do that on a moment's notice, the passing of this bill of UMT will make me the next President of the United States, if you vote in favor of it.

As a retired Army officer, I consider that I am still under oath to defend the Constitution against all enemies, domestic as well as foreign. I consider this proposal as being promoted by domestic enemies. Therefore, I have no alternative but to oppose it with all the power at my command.

With this understanding, I shall now proceed to analyze the program of the National Security Training Commission, applying the established techniques of a military "estimate of the situation."

This is the standard form of analysis which the Pentagon must apply to every military problem. Such an estimate is divided into five parts, called paragraphs: (1) The mission, (2) an analysis of the opposing forces, (3) an analysis of our own forces, (4) consideration of various possible plans, and (5), the decision as to a course of action.

UMT cannot be considered as operating in a vacuum. It must be analyzed in relation to the total military situation. If you are going to pour billions of dollars into any military training plan, which is going to affect the lives of every American boy, you must be sure that it will contribute to the over-all military policy, and advance national security. If you are going to train these boys, you must look ahead and see how you would use them.

Otherwise, you might as well give these billions of dollars to Chiang Kai-shek, as you already have given about \$5 billion.

Let us consider first the mission. This is the key to any military plan, and it is the Army doctrine that any soldier, from the private up to the highest general, must keep this mission before him at all times, and never lose sight of it. What is the mission, the purpose, to be achieved by this training program? What objectives must be held before training commanders and trainees, toward which training shall be directed?

It is clear that no training mission has been legally assigned, and, therefore, that no intelligent training program can be developed. Without the clear expression of mission the entire proposal collapses.

The situation today is, in my opinion, exactly as it was in 1946. At that time I met Lt. Gen. Willard Paul, then G-1, personnel, of the Army outside the committee room of the House Military Affairs Committee, right out in this hall, as hearings on UMT were about to commence, and protested to him: "Willard, you haven't made any estimate of the situation.' You haven't determined your training mission, or how many boys are to be trained, or when, or why, or how, or how they would be retained in an emergency, yet you are demanding all American boys, now."

He replied hurriedly: "I know, I know, but we have to have this now."

His statement was paralleled by another one made to me personally by a captain of the Navy whose name I do not remember, as we sat side by side in the committee room of the Senate, listening to a report in favor of UMT by an admiral of the Navy. I asked him what in creation the Navy wanted with UMT, and he replied substantially: "We don't like it, and don't need it. We can train better without it. But we have to go along with the Army boys."

I maintain that these statements were admissions of fraud against the American people, and that these officers were unfit to serve the people in any capacity. I maintain that the same situation of fraud exists within the Pentagon today. The Pentagon has made no true "estimate of the situation"—or if it has, it has not made it known to the public or to this committee—to determine the mission, or how many, or how, or when, or where.

They say "give us all of your boys, and by-and-by we'll work out an intelligent training program." They are trying to put this vicious proposal over on the people on the wave of war hysteria, as they manufactured the same hysteria in 1946 for the same purpose.

Surely the American people have not assigned any mission for the training of their boys, through any legal process. The people hate this thing called UMT with a bitter, burning hatred. The chief purpose of the plan of the Training Commission must be obviously, to produce a plan to sell the people on something they don't want, otherwise, when Congress "takes another look" it will surely scrap the plan.

I maintain that the Pentagon is like the camel. It wants to get its nose under the tent. It doesn't matter what sort of a plan it gives you today. Once they put the plan before you, they will have before you modification after modification until they build up the finest military machine you ever saw.

The Congress has not assigned any training mission, for it was promised such "another look" at UMT before decision was made. I deny that Congress has any constitutional authority to vote our 18-year-old boys into the UMT concentration camps, so that tired, old men can push these immature boys out in front, and sit back and grow fat in fancied security.

I wonder what boy in Korea is now saving you and me in the United States, and dying and shedding his blood so that we can be secure at home.

We didn't ask them whether they wanted to go.

Many Members of Congress, as individuals, hate the proposal as do the rest of the people, and as elected representatives of the people are determined to do what they can to kill the proposal.

This committee itself, as far as I can determine, has not assigned any mission for the Training Commission. It had no mandate from the people or from Congress to do so. Its members are, themselves, by no means unanimous as to the need or soundness of UMT.

Therefore, since no mission was assigned to the Training Commission, and since no one except a small minority wants UMT, the question arises, "Who wants UMT?"

That was the question I was prepared to answer had we been granted permission to attack UMT in principle. That question has hardly even been hinted at, much less answered in the long years that this fight to subvert the will of the people has gone on. It is impossible to discuss this plan of the Training Commission intelligently without discussing these hidden forces. Unless these forces which are conspiring to impose UMT on the American people are revealed, the United States will continue its headlong course toward disaster. I have prepared a separate analysis of this problem, which I have filed with your chairman, and at the conclusion of this statement I should like permission to continue on with a discussion of who wants war and who wants UMT.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me say to the witness: His separate statement which he has filed with us is not relevant to the issue and can't be printed in the record as a part of his testimony.

General HOLDRIDGE. Then I should like to have it included as part of my official statement.

The CHAIRMAN. It can't be included because it is not germane and it is irrelevant. So you go ahead with your prepared statement, which the committee is following.

General HOLDRIDGE. I shall take that, however, to the people. They want to know.

The CHAIRMAN. All right; go ahead.

General HOLDRIDGE. I wish it established, then, for the purpose of this record that the three forces in the United States that must have war, and that want UMT as a backlog for war, are the "Invisible Government" of the Wall Street cartelists; the political arm of the Vatican—I am not quarreling with anybody's religion, but the political arm of the Vatican and the militarists of the Pentagon. These are the three forces of fascism that worked in Spain and Italy and Germany and destroyed those countries and they are operating here today.

So let me now proceed with my analysis of an estimate of the situation.

Returning to the issue of mission:

We find that, lacking any specific directive from the people or from Congress, the Training Commission thrust its arm down into the darkness, and fished out its own mission. This is stated on page 4 of its report, as follows:

The ultimate obligation of citizenship—the bearing of arms in defense of the community—shall now be explicit.

This statement, coupled with that on page 5 to the effect that the United States must live under frontier conditions for many years,

ready for immediate attack, envisions the conversion of the United States into a completely integrated, militarized, Fascist-police state.

That statement might well have been written by the Fascists of ancient Sparta, which was one of the first of the military-police states of history, and which demanded full military service from every male, not from 18 years of age, but from childhood. It went so far as to throw its physically deficient children to the wolves, if they were unfit for military duty. Perhaps that will be the next step of the Pentagon.

We, of the American Rally, reject any such concept, any such self-imposed mission. It is a completely fatalistic, negative, suicidal assumption. We consider citizenship as a function of life, not of death; of peaceful cooperation for the common good, not of the promotion of internal and external violence. Such philosophies, inspired by the Pentagon, and implemented by its hand-picked mouthpieces on the Training Commission, assume that national policies must be founded on wars and preparations for wars, because peaceful alternatives cannot be found. We disagree, for we know that peaceful alternatives can be found. We have found them.

We propose to present those peaceful alternatives to the people of the United States in the coming election. Having, out of thin air, assigned this fraudulent mission to itself, the Training Commission proceeds to deny this mission in its own plan. If it is truly believed that we must return to frontier conditions, it would go the full length in implementation, but it makes provision for training only the male population.

On our frontiers, as you will remember, the women were the "minute men," and might at any moment have to reach for the musket over the mantelpiece to repel an attack by Indians. If we need universal military training at all—which we deny—we need it for the girls as well as the boys.

In the holocaust of atomic war toward which our barbaric leaders are hurrying us, girls as well as boys might well be taught such techniques of survival as are practicable. This frontier philosophy of violence itself is false, for the Quakers showed even in colonial days that it was possible for the settlers and the Indians to get along side by side in peace. The crimes of violence perpetrated against the Indians are matched today by the crime of violence against Korea.

And I would like to interpolate at this point that if this committee believes that we must live in frontier conditions, then I suggest you bring your muskets and your bows and arrows to your office with you every morning, because you are on the firing line.

Washington, D. C., is target No. 1 in world war III, when the atomic war starts. See how far your .30-caliber rifles will get you.

Thus, we see the Training Commission starting off on the false premise of a fraudulent training mission of violence, and is attempting to erect a sound training structure on such false premises—an impossible task.

Taking its false premise at its face value, however, let us proceed to the next step in our "estimate of the situation": consideration of the forces of the enemy, and of our own forces. Who is the enemy? What is his strength? What are our own forces, their strength? Let me repeat, UMT cannot operate in a vacuum. It must be considered in

relation to the total military situation. Without consideration of the secret forces operating within the United States who want war and want UMT, our analysis on this point must necessarily be defective.

Who is the external enemy? The enemy is an idea, an ideology, promoted by certain nations. To attack the idea we must attack these nations. Formerly, the idea was held almost exclusively within Russia, so in 1918 we waged another undeclared, unconstitutional war against Russia with the purpose of destroying this idea. To check the idea we sent troops to Murmansk and Siberia.

I want it clearly understood that I am not in sympathy with this idea. I see its dangers clearly, more clearly than our propagandists. But it is obvious that the only defense against a bad idea is a better idea. Ideas cannot be destroyed with gunfire, and that is what we are trying to do.

During World War II, we made friends with this "bad" idea, and fought side by side with its proponents. But the idea was still the enemy, and, according to our foreign policy, must be encircled with weapons wherever it occurred. First, we had to check it in Europe. Then, when like a rash, it spread to the Balkans, we had to fight it there. Then it spread to Korea, and then to all China, and must be fought there.

Our frontiersmen, in defending their families and their firesides, didn't grab their muskets and go barging all over the world looking for enemies. But now our 18-year-old boys are doing just that under the draft, and under UMT are to be prepared to extend the area of conflict. Since the enemy is an idea, and since we must fight every country which subscribes to the idea, we have arrived at the point where we must, coldly and critically, make an estimate of the likelihood of being able to accomplish this military adventure, of which UMT is an integral part.

Under this military policy the United States is face to face with disaster. It could not succeed in implementing this policy even if every 18-year-old boy had already been trained under UMT and were already under arms. Our military front has collapsed all over the world as well as at home.

We have no military front today. In the Far East we have suffered a shameful defeat which has cost the lives of thousands of our boys, has murdered hundreds of thousands of innocent women and children in Korea, and has destroyed the industry of that unhappy country. This is the most vicious example of brutality and mass murder in the history of the world. Still, it has not paid off.

General Bradley calls it a stalemate, but he must know full well that if Russia threw her full military might, including her air power and submarines, behind the Chinese—a decision she dare not forego when all of the chips are down—we shall be thrown out of Korea, and our boys slaughtered on the beaches.

Already we are so deeply committed, overextended, and pinned down in Korea that if the Chinese move into Indochina as now seems likely, we shall have nothing to throw in at that point. We must face the harsh fact that financial colonialism is finished for the United States in the Far East as it is for Great Britain in India and Iran, and in Egypt.

Soon, we shall be driven out of Japan, Formosa and the Philippines. And UMT can do nothing to prevent this disaster. In Eu-

rope, Eisenhower has suffered a like major diplomatic and military disaster. The nations of Western Europe dare not come to our aid in Asia, because they dare not come to our aid in Western Europe. They are all looking down Russia's throat. They see in what has happened to Korea a dread example to nations which offer themselves as battlefields to protect the economic ideology of the United States. They know that the heterogeneous forces which Eisenhower might assemble would be easily overrun in a matter of hours.

Churchill, as I predicted months ago, has already won his point that the British Isles shall not be used as an atomic bombing base against Russia, for he knows that the British Isles would be blasted into the sea by the first Russian atomic attack. The same attitude must be taken by every European country. It is obvious that our troops are already bypassed in Europe, as they were in the Philippines at the outbreak of the war with Japan. I happened to be in the Philippines at the time just before the war broke out and we knew we were bypassed. Every soldier in Germany knows he is bypassed and is lost today.

Our soldiers would be slaughtered on the beaches in the event of a war with Russia. Any reinforcements we might send through UMT or otherwise would likewise be lost.

We have lost the military initiative all over the world. Our western front, like our eastern front, has collapsed, and UMT can do nothing about this. It is already too late, and even had we had UMT from the beginning the results would still be the same.

We, as a small Nation of 155 million people, and lacking any allies, cannot, single-handed, challenge the masses of Asia and Europe, backed by the considerable productive capacity of Russia as well as by the total productive capacity of Western Europe which would immediately fall into Russia's hands, unless we first used the atom bomb on our erstwhile friends. That practical possibility must cause our European friends to shudder in their nightmares.

Thus, we come to our home front. How can UMT, at home, combat the ideology of communism, backed by the military might of much of the rest of the world? To answer this question we must consider the full enemy potential. What is the worst that Russia could do to us? We have no reason to expect anything but the worst, if this issue is carried to its logical conclusion.

The sword of Damocles hangs over our head—the atom bomb. When the truth dawns on us at last that we have already met with military disaster in Asia and Europe, the critical moment of decision will arrive as to the use of the atom bomb. The decision will hardly be made by Russia. Russia is accomplishing her objectives at little military cost to herself, is forcing us to overextend militarily all over the world and economically at home, and will unquestionably go to any length to avoid atomic war, for which she would have to pay too great a price. Neither is she likely to invade us by land armies, for she lacks the naval means. Instead, she will probably continue to draw us far across two oceans to fight at the end of long lines of communications.

Thus the decisions will probably be made in the United States. A considerable propaganda has already been built up for the prior use of the atom bomb by the United States. After World War II the slogan: "Hit Russia now" was promoted in the Pentagon and in other

areas of power. Mr. Truman has already twice given the command to "commence firing" with the atom bomb when there was no military justification for its use, for Japan was already defeated, thus committing an act more "dastardly" than the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. He has callously promised to use it again "if necessary," thus playing God—or the Devil—to destroy civilization.

General Eisenhower, with equal cynicism, has urged our prior use of the atom bomb at any time practical considerations outweigh moral factors.

Father Edmund Walsh, of the Society of Jesuits, head of the Georgetown University School of Foreign Affairs, who has taught thousands of budding young American diplomats the "party line" of the Vatican, has written an entire book, *Total Power*, to give moral justification for the prior use of the atom bomb by the United States, using as his major argument the fact that Jesus of Nazareth, the Prince of Peace, drove the money-changers from the temple. The conspirators behind the scenes that want UMT must have war, and will not hesitate to use the atom bomb to keep themselves in power.

So it is safe to assume that the United States will launch the A-bomb attack, and will justify the crime as being the will of Almighty God. It is quite conceivable that the lunatics who determine our policies may incite another "incident," such as the sinking of the battleship *Maine*, or the bombing of Pearl Harbor, so that an American plane, bearing the Red Star of Russia, piloted by an American crew, will drop an American atom bomb on an American city, to give justification for carrying the atomic war to Russia. Then the lights will go out all over the world.

Thus, we come to the problem of internal defense, and the relationship of UMT thereto.

As I stated before, Russia is hardly capable of invading with land armies, and once the atom war is launched would certainly retaliate in kind. She may use aircraft based on Anadyr in Siberia, or submarines, or she may already have planted her atomic weapons, by saboteurs, in every major city throughout the United States, ready to be fired at a moment's notice. I warned of this potentiality as early as 1946, but was jeered at by the Pentagon. A year or so ago, however, Eisenhower belatedly awakened to our peril and confirmed this threat before congressional committees. General Vandenberg has warned that 70 percent of Russia's planes could get through. Military leaders admit that as many as 69 of our major industrial cities would be destroyed in a few hours. Our atomic scientists, and every intelligent military and political leaders, has emphasized over and over again that there is no defense.

Thus, at home, as abroad, our defenses are wide open, and we face military disaster. What can UMT, under the training program of the Training Commission, do to save us?

The answer is nothing. Exactly nothing.

At the first atomic attack our industries and our communications systems would be destroyed, our National Capital would be blotted out, Congress would cease to exist, the Pentagon would disappear. One hundred million Americans, two-thirds of our population would become casualties. Mr. Truman might survive if he escaped soon enough to the Berchtesgaden that is reported to have been constructed in the mountains of Pennsylvania. But the United States as we

have known it would vanish. Russia, too, would suffer horribly, but with her more extensive territory and her greater decentralization, she would have better prospects of survival than we.

What of UMT trainees? Those trained for the Navy, Marine Corps, or Air Forces, presuming that any were still alive, and able to function, would be unable to move to their posts of duty. The posts of duty themselves would have disappeared. Those boys trained for the Army would be scattered, unarmed, and helpless. It is unlikely, as I have stated, that Russia would invade. She could, if she wishes, leave us to rot and try to pull ourselves out of our wreckage, which would take generations. If she had sufficient military potential remaining for an invasion by ground forces, it is unlikely that any cohesive force could be brought against her. It is not only a matter of manpower, but of logistics, and the logistics end of it has hardly been mentioned.

Certainly, the scattered, shocked, unarmed, unsupplied, leaderless UMT trainees could not be mobilized for any such purpose as to repel a mass invasion, should it occur. The United States would probably degenerate into a military feudalism with local leaders trying to establish order out of chaos with such facilities as might exist. These would be concerned with the sheer problem of survival—of decontamination, water supply, food, shelter, communications, and sanitation, not with .30 caliber machine guns.

This is the critical military problem before the United States, and not one item of training under UMT prepares for this dire emergency. This constitutes criminal negligence.

In our "estimate of the situation" we come to paragraph 4, the plan itself.

In the light of our dire, immediate, military situation and of the vast ideological, political, and military forces involved, the actual plan of the Training Commission is too trivial and too superficial to warrant serious consideration. It carefully sets up its own bureaucratic existence. It establishes a punitive system. It gives us figures on cost which, as always in dealing with the military, are open to suspicion. And I like to interpolate there. Mr. Ray Wilson of the Quakers showed you some figures where the Pentagon has not showed you the truth of cost.

It presents trivial training programs of the stereotyped "doughboy" type, for the various services, which show on the face of them that the militarists have not thought their way through the problem and are only now, by their own admission, and after all these years, supposed to be making some headway on detail. It throws in as a sop the outline of a proposed lecture on citizenship which should, and can, be better taught at our educational institutions. In its full effect, it is nothing less than a "junior draft," a peacetime draft, and that is what should be called and not UMT, and a training cadre for the draft.

At no time does it envision the extent of our military debacle, or relate the problem of training specifically to that problem. All in all, it is an insult to our intelligence. "The mountain labored and brought forth a mouse."

There are two obvious areas in which UMT has validity, but which have been intentionally omitted from all discussions. It is important that these factors be brought into the open.

Mass armies can still perform two functions. The first is to fight a limited war, such as the war in Korea, and only as long as it remains limited, and then only with control of the air. A similar war might be fought with mass armies in Mexico or South America, for example, if it is the purpose of the madmen at the helm to impose the imperialistic "American century" by force of arms, using the same pretext as were used in Korea. The Latin-American countries, also, must have nightmares on this score.

We have seen in Korea that it is impossible to limit a war against major power, for once we have adopted violence as a fundamental principle of national policy, we are led inevitably to the use of the atom bomb, and to suicide.

Other than for a limited war, the major purpose for which UMT would be practical and suitable would be to repress our own population on the home front.

My own interest in social and economic reconstruction was first aroused in Chicago in the winter of 1931-32. Late one night, at the height of the depression, I saw a veteran of World War I in the middle of a freezing blizzard pulling his GI overcoat around him as he tried to sell his little pyramid of apples under the elevated in the Loop and literally freezing to death. I knew that at that time the Army in collaboration with the Illinois National Guard was working on mobilization plans for street fighting to shoot down such men as this veteran if he dared protest against the economic situation in which he found himself. Today—and again I should like to interpolate that one of the major problems that was under consideration in Chicago was the necessity for shooting down the colored people. There was a great problem in the colored district of Chicago and there was the headache and they discussed it in the secret counsel of the headquarters.

Today we are heading toward a more serious economic collapse, which is staved off momentarily only because we are using mass murder as our major national industry. We continued to eat at home only because American GI's are dying in Korea—a form of social cannibalism.

Let me interrupt again, gentlemen, because these are significant. They have come into my life and I would like to pass them on to you. I published a letter—the Detroit News published a letter that I had written, Americans Living Off Korea War—and it shocked the entire city of Detroit, and a little mailman said to his mother-in-law, who was living prosperously and proud of our prosperity—he said, "If this prosperity were in a glass, you wouldn't drink it, because that is the blood of our American soldiers."

The broad program of UMT and the superficial plan of the Training Commission fit in perfectly with this program of internal repression. I warn this committee and the American people that the major purpose of UMT is part of the struggle for the minds of the American people—to condition the minds of our youth to the totalitarian philosophies of Hitlerism which have taken root in the United States since World War II. This is a drive to capture the minds of our American youth, to indoctrinate those with the repressive philosophies of the Pentagon, and to maintain in power those invisible forces which are behind the program of war and behind this program of UMT.

After World War II, a classmate, Gen. Ernie Harmon, was placed in command of a "constabulary" in Germany—a striking force organized as a flying squadron—the American version of the German storm-troopers—to strike suddenly at a particular German city by ground and air, and while it was still suffering from its shock to strike suddenly at another city far away.

I submit that these tactics are in keeping with the philosophies of the Pentagon as I have known them, and that this constabulary might well have been a laboratory test for similar tactics on the home front. I have no doubt that our high command would strike as willingly against American workers as they did against German cities. I challenge the Pentagon to deny that such plans are not resting in their appropriate pigeonholes, ready to be used at the proper moment.

Another phase of this problem of UMT must be mentioned. We were informed by your chairman that no argument would be acceptable against the principle of UMT, but now we find that members of the Training Commission are permitted to introduce arguments in favor. Dr. Compton, for example, reiterates that our boys will leave the UMT camps with higher moral standards than when they entered. I must answer, in one brief paragraph, this entire argumentation of the so-called social byproducts of UMT: Health, morality, education, leadership, discipline, training in democracy, etc.

The people have learned that, at a fraction of the cost these socially desirable ends can be honestly achieved under our existing civilian institutions, as they could never be achieved under the military. They know that health belongs to all of the people, girls as well as boys, men as well as women, and that it should be assured throughout life and not be limited to the 18-year-old bracket. They know that morality cannot emerge from an environment never famous for its morality. They know that education given under military supervision would be toward hatred and violence, not good will and peace. They know that Prussian military indoctrination develops "drivership" and "followership", not leadership. They know that our military discipline is the discipline of the reformatory, not of freemen. They know that democracy cannot emerge from a caste-ridden totalitarian bureaucracy which detests democracy.

The people should know by now that they cannot believe these leaders who are now going to have supervision over our boys. During World War II, General Marshall promised the parents of 18-year-old boys drafted into the service that they would be given a year's conditioning before being placed in the battle line. I presented a training plan which would accomplish this purpose, better than any plan the general staff had to offer, but officers in the Pentagon were afraid to admit that they had even seen it. In spite of Marshall's promises, these boys, in a few short weeks, lay dead on the battlefields of the world, martyrs to the military alibi: "Military necessity." And I tell you again, they bring this bill before you, and if you pass it they will amend it and amend it and then when they get a situation which they think is right, they say "Military necessity," and everything Congress has done will go by the board.

I was forced to repeat those falsehoods then, and did so believing that General Marshall was telling the truth. He was lying then. He and the rest of the brass are lying now, in all of their noble promises about UMT. They have no intention of keeping those promises.

They are, like the proverbial camel, trying to get their noses under the tent, and once that is done, the rest of the program of converting the Nation into a Fascist police state will follow as a matter of course. I would not believe the military leaders of the Pentagon under oath. Neither do I believe the members of the Training Commission, for they have tied themselves to the chariot wheel of the Pentagon, and have sold themselves to the devil. If you are wise, neither will you, nor the parents of these boys, believe them.

Let me interpolate. Every boy enlisted in the United States and promised all this and heaven, too, knows the military lies because once he has signed his name on a dotted line, they do as they please with him. They have proven their unreliability by their own acts.

We come at last to the final part of our estimate of the situation—the decision.

The real purpose, the mission, of UMT is not to defend the United States; for, as I have shown by military analysis, it can contribute nothing to that purpose. The real purpose is to use UMT to transform the United States into a Fascist-military state, and to repress our own population. If that is what you want, then you should recommend the passage of this act to the Congress of the United States. But let it be done openly, with all of the evidence out in the clear where the people can see it, not surreptitiously as a conspiracy.

This proposal for UMT is unreal as applied to the best interests of the people of the United States, even from the strictly military point of view. We have reached the end of a military era. In my own time I have seen the Army expand from an insignificant 80,000 men and an inconsequential National Guard, into a major national industry employing $3\frac{1}{2}$ million men—during World War II over 10 million—costing the taxpayers hundreds of billions of dollars. Throughout my career I heard nothing but the griping of Army officers that the United States was defenseless due to the short-sightedness of Congress. Year after year the budget has been increased. Our Army has increased in manpower, with a considerable percentage undergoing violent training in Korea. A new weapon, air power, with its deadly gasoline bomb, was introduced during World War II. A still more deadly bomb, the atom bomb, capable of blowing civilization to hell in 24 hours, is on the firing line. Other weapons of horror are in preparation: \$100 billion is available this year to export violence. Next year the sum is estimated at \$95 billion. And still the military screams that we are defenseless, demands more and more men and more and more money. On top of it all it throws into our teeth the ultimatum that if we do not yield on this final plan for UMT, calling for the full mobilization of our youth, we shall be courting disaster.

Well, disaster has already overtaken us, and all of the UMT in the world could not have prevented it. It should be obvious that there is a catch in the reasoning of the Pentagon. Either it has been criminally negligent in expending the vast sums appropriated for defense, or we have reached a military impasse, or both.

Both are true. The military has wasted billions of dollars thrown at it which it did not know how to expend wisely, because money alone could not provide security.

But primarily, we have reached a situation of military stalemate relative to the atom bomb, such as was reached during World War I in trench warfare, except that now any increase in military power

merely accentuates the stalemate. Militarism and military armaments have been carried to the ultimate absurdity—and threat. When the first atom bomb fell on Hiroshima every prior concept of military might as an instrument of power politics became obsolete. Thereafter the submission of any international issue to the gage of armed conflict must lead inevitably to the use of the atom bomb, and such use means national and world suicide. A new, and final, military maxim emerges: "The more armament, the less security"—a military maxim to end all military maxims.

In this military blind alley UMT is totally unrealistic. We are trying, in this plan of the Training Commission, to prepare to solve major social, economic, and ideological problems with gunfire. UMT is totally useless in the situation. Having failed to achieve national security through the draft, even with our 18-year-old boys scattered all over the world, the barbarians who direct our policies now propose that the tail go with the hide, and throw this juvenile, moronic plan of UMT in our faces.

We, of the American Rally, shall oppose to the end any decision to fasten UMT upon the American people through this, or any other, plan. We insist that we apply positive alternatives. Through violence lies national and world disaster.

There are positive alternatives, and if given the opportunity—and if our people are ready to face the facts of life with mature minds—we can show very easily how our national security can be assured without military armaments of any kind, by removing the causes of war, and thus removing the need for UMT. We have a positive program to submit, which we are prevented from presenting here due to the arbitrary decision of your committee to override the wishes of the American people. That program cannot be presented without a prior analysis of the underlying causes of war, which have led automatically to this proposal for UMT.

We urge you, therefore, in your decision, to reject, once and for all, this iniquitous plan to implement UMT, as the people have already rejected UMT. Reject for all time the militarization of the United States by the Pentagon and the other forces of fascism which are now rampant in the country. A vote for UMT is a vote for the Wall Street cartelists; a vote for UMT is a vote for the Pentagon militarists; a vote for UMT is a vote for the Vatican; a vote for UMT is against the American people.

Turn your attention, we urge you, toward positive alternatives while there is still time. Otherwise the United States will go the way of Nineveh, and Babylon, and Rome, and Hitler Germany.

And now, Mr. Chairman, I have a concluding statement I wish to make here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the witness has expired.

The next witness is Mr. Brooks. You have a statement?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes. I have a letter here from a little lady down in Centenary College in my district, Miss Bettie Rea Fox. She is director of youth work and she is also president of the Methodist Youth Fellowship, which is an organization of some 20,000 people.

The CHAIRMAN. Put it in the record.

Mr. BROOKS. I ask unanimous consent.